

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated October 8, 2004, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

Submitted herewith is a corrected drawing Figure 1 including the legend "Prior Art." No new matter has been added.

Moreover, the specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error in a manner suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AAPA shown in Figure 1. Moreover, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA.

By the above amendments, claims 1-4 have been canceled without prejudice and new claim 5 has been added. No new matter has been added. Also, Applicant has considered the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 1 during the preparation of new claim 5. Examination and allowance of the newly added claim 5 is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. New claim 5 requires a pivot seat having a recess for receiving a third water proof ring, wherein the recess is dimensioned and configured to hold the third water proof ring on an outer surface of the pivot seat, a positioning

seat comprising an opening for receiving the threaded portion therein, the positioning seat further comprising a column wherein the first and second water proof rings are tightly positioned against an inner wall of the column, and a circular protrusion extending for an upper surface of the column, wherein the third water proof ring is tightly positioned on top of the circular protrusion providing additional water-proofing means. Clearly, the AAPA shown in Figure 1 does not illustrate a third water proof ring positioned in a manner required by new claim 5. Therefore, claim 5 is believed to be patentable over AAPA shown in Figure 1.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claim 5. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated October 8, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claim 5 is in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Submitted herewith for approval by the Examiner is one Replacement Sheet of drawing with proposed changes.